

Initial Guidance for Student Learning Objectives in Utah



SCOTT MARION
smarion@nciea.org
CENTER FOR ASSESSMENT
www.nciea.org

FEBRUARY 7, 2012

Advance Organizer

2

- Two major topics today
- Reviewing draft SLO guidance
- Focus on tested subjects and grades



SLO Guidance Outline DRAFT

3

- The draft guidance is an initial outline that both tries to capture our discussions at the last meeting and pushes some ideas based on what is done in other states or based on my experience as a measurement and evaluation expert



Process

4

- First, I'd like you all to take 15-20 minutes to read through the outline individually and make notes and comments about points you'd like to discuss further.
- Second, we will work through each of the points to refine our thinking and this outline
- I will then send you, in advance of the March 8th meeting, a revised and more elaborated SLO guidance.



Objectives (1-3)

5

1. All educator evaluations shall include a minimum of 2-4 individual student academic objectives per educator.
2. Each educator evaluation shall include at least one aggregate objective. This may be in alignment with a school wide goal or could be a grade level or content area goal (typically for middle or high school).
3. Educator evaluations may include non-content-based objectives (e.g., social/emotional), but these shall be in support of content-based objectives and in addition to the 2-4 minimum number of academic objectives.



Objectives (4-6)

6

4. Objectives for each individual teacher should be related, to the extent possible, to the school improvement goals.
5. Objectives for each teacher should be as representative of the set of courses/subjects they teach as possible. For example, a middle or high school teacher should have objectives from multiple sections or courses. This does not mean that every course/section is represented, but there should be an effort to ensure such representation over time.
6. The objectives shall be linked to the Utah core content standards in each course.



Objectives (7-10)

7

7. The objectives shall focus on specific content standards, where applicable.
8. Growth-based objectives should be encouraged and employed only where possible to do so in technically defensible ways
9. Objectives shall be ambitious and tied to varying levels of performance as opposed to a simple dichotomous (meets / does not meet) results.
10. The objectives shall be established as “close to the individual students as possible.” This is not a requirement for setting individual student objectives in all classes, but may involve establishing overall class or school goals and then allowing variation from these goals based on the current achievement levels of individual students.



Objective Setting Process (1-3)

8

1. The school principal shall sign off on all objectives for educators in his/her building.
2. Each educator shall have considerable say in establishing her/his objectives and shall also sign off on all objectives for which they will be evaluated.
3. In addition to school administrators, teams of educators shall be involved in establishing grade level, department, or school level objectives. Teams members may include, members of the same academic department, grade level colleagues, district content area experts.



Objective Setting Process (4-6)

4. Each district shall create a process for ensuring that objectives across the district are as comparable as possible. This may include having district level personnel involved in establishing a district framework and/or participating on peer teams to set objectives for educators. Further, the principal shall consider comparability when approving all objectives in the building. This guidance is not meant to contradict the recommendation for setting objectives as close to the individual student as possible, rather there is an interest in balancing comparability with individual student needs.
5. Relevant performance data on students for whom objectives will be set as well as data from the same course in prior years shall be used to assist in establishing meaningful objectives.
6. The objectives for a full year course must be established within the first month of the school year. For half-year courses, objectives should be established within the first two weeks of the course.



Assessments (1-3)

10

1. State CRTs shall be used to evaluate the SLOs for subjects/grades where available.
2. Common benchmark tests created by the district or other entities shall be used to evaluate SLOs to the extent that the assessment provides a valid measure of the SLO.
3. USOE shall facilitate the development of resources/tools (e.g., common rubrics, common assessments) as examples to aid in the assessment of SLOs in non-tested subjects and grades.



Assessments (4-5)

11

4. The relative weighting of shared attribution, state exams, and local assessments shall be determined by each district within parameters determined by the USOE Student Growth Workgroup.
5. The rating for each educator for the Student Performance component of the evaluation shall be determined based upon the various levels of student performance on the appropriate measures. For example, an index system can be developed for students scoring at various levels of a rubric or a simple point system based on the number of students meeting or not meeting a defined benchmark.



Assessments (6-7)

12

6. Because the Student Growth Workgroup is concerned about the cost, both in terms of time and money, of creating new common assessments for courses/grades where there are currently no state-supported assessments, a criteria for quality student assessments will be established, state models and examples will be provided, and local districts and schools will be provided professional learning on creating quality assessments. This is an important aspect of building professional human capacity.
7. *Educator performance on the SLOs shall be scored using three categories (exceeded SLO, met SLO, did not meet SLO).*



Oversight & Support (1-3)

13

1. The Student Growth Workgroup and the entire Educator Evaluation Project needs to create clear guidance for creating a local SLO process that includes at a minimum, most of the items described herein.
2. A State Advisory Review Committee shall be established to review and support the SLO process including evaluating the quality and rigor of objectives, measures, and performance expectations (what counts as “good enough”). This Advisory Review Committee will be designed to ameliorate differences in SLOs across districts due, in part, to differences in district capacity.
3. USOE along with the Advisory Review Committee shall develop a resource bank of exemplar SLOs and potential assessment instruments.



Oversight & Support

14

4. USOE along with the Advisory Review Committee shall design a structure and process for providing professional development on the design & development of an SLO process for each district.
5. USOE shall provide a formative evaluation of the educator evaluation pilot in each of the next two school years (2012-13 and 2013-14) with special attention paid to the efficacy of the SLO process and outcomes.
6. Comparability of SLOs and SLO outcomes is a major concern of the Student Growth Workgroup. As such, the workgroup recommends developing a process with training materials to ensure comparability of goals and objectives starting from the classroom (i.e., multiple SLOs within the same classroom should be comparable) to the school, district, and state.



Additional Comments

15

- Are there any additional comments, concerns, suggestions for the revised guidance documents?

